

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

CALEB D. GLICK, §  
§  
Plaintiff, §  
§  
v. § Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-00350-O-BP  
§  
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, §  
§  
Defendant. §

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation (the “FCR”) in this case. Plaintiff timely filed an objection. The District Court reviewed *de novo*<sup>1</sup> the proposed Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation. Finding no error, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand (ECF No. 6) is **DENIED**, Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 10) is **GRANTED**, and Plaintiff’s claims are **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

**SO ORDERED** this 1st day of July, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Reed O'Connor  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Plaintiff repeatedly raises the concern that Magistrate Judge Ray’s “falsification(s) will mislead Judge O’Connor in his ruling(s).” Pl.’s Objection 4, ECF No. 19; *see also id.* at 5, 6, 8, 9, 10. The Court assures Plaintiff that his concerns are misplaced given that a *de novo* review mandates a from-scratch review of the record and application of the law to the facts of this case as understood from the Court’s independent review notwithstanding Magistrate Judge Ray’s FCR. This from-scratch assessment is precisely the type of review the Court conducted here due to the filing of an objection. Having independently reviewed this case and the applicable law, the Court reaches the same conclusions as the FCR.